28 | PLDGS\115104.DEC

I, LAWRENCE E. HELLER, declare as follows:

- before the United States District Court, Central District of California. I am also a principal in the law firm of Turner, Gerstenfeld, Wilk, Tigerman & Heller. In said capacities I am responsible for the representation of the Church of Spiritual Technology ("CST" hereinafter) in the case of Religious Technology Center, et al. v. Wollersheim, et al, Case Nos. 85-711-JMI (Bx) and 85-7197-JMI (Gx), and I am (local) counsel for Author Services, Inc. ("ASI" hereinafter) in the instant case of Vicki J. Aznaran, et al. v. Church of Scientology of California, et al. Accordingly, I am familiar with all of the following facts and I am available to personally testify thereto, if necessary.
- 2. This Declaration is being written in response to plaintiffs' Opposition to the Motion to Recuse Judge James M. Ideman filed by the attorney for plaintiffs, Ford Greene, in the case of Aznaran v. Church of Scientology of California. Specifically, I am responding to the contentions in that Opposition that the Church of Spiritual Technology (among other entities) has moved to disqualify Judge Ideman for purely tactical purposes. Attorney Greene also asserts in his opposition that the Church of Spiritual Technology (along with other defendants) has a "history of maintaining extreme litigation practices, the objective of which is, solely, to win at any cost." (Pages 1 and 2 of Opposition.)

-2-

3. Attorney Greene's contentions in this regard are, to say the least, ironic in view of the fact that CST is not a party to the Aznaran litigation. Furthermore, the defendant that I do represent in the Aznaran litigation, ASI, has not joined in the Motion Disqualify Judge Ideman.

4. Furthermore, it is of note that neither ASI nor CST

instigated the litigation in which they are respectively involved. ASI was sued as a defendant in the Aznaran litigation even though neither of the Aznarans, to this declarant's knowledge, were employed by or worked for ASI. It is undisputed that CST, a counter-defendant in the Religious Technology Center litigation, was incorporated after counter-claimant David Mayo departed from the Church of Scientology. Accordingly, CST had neither any connection with nor ever contact with Mr. Mayo. Nevertheless it was sued.

- 5. The <u>Religious Technology Center</u> litigation deals with copyright infringement and related claims. CST does not hold or license any of the copyrights at issue nor has it ever, throughout the course of its tenure, given any religious, or other, services to Scientology parishioners, other than to its own staff members. Accordingly, it is this declarant's contention that neither ASI nor CST should even be parties to either of the subject litigations.
- 6. I have personally represented both ASI and CST for a number of years. To my recollection, I have never been attorney of record for either of these entities as plaintiffs in any

-3-

lawsuits. Based thereon, attorney Greene's assertion that CST (or even ASI for that matter) have engaged in "extreme litigation practices" in order "to win at any cost" is absurd.

7. Plaintiffs' opposition also intimates that CST, among other Scientology entities, in some unspecified fashion has engaged in unethical litigation practices. I hereby state unequivocally that no one at either CST, ASI or, for that matter, any other Scientology entity or organization has ever requested that I engage in any unethical or harrassive litigation tactics. In fact, I would challenge the plaintiffs and their counsel to point out any actions which my clients have taken in either the Aznaran or the Religious Technology Center litigation which he, or anyone else, could consider harrassive.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 16th day of October, 1991, at Beverly Hills, California.

LAWRENCE E. HELLER